

REMARKS

This Amendment is in response to the Office Action dated May 18, 2007. In the Office Action, claims 20-39 were rejected. With this Amendment, claims 20, 25, 27, 31 and 35 are amended. It is respectfully submitted that all pending claims 20-39 are in condition for allowance.

I. Interview Summary

Applicant's attorney would like to thank the Examiner for the courtesies extended during a telephone interview on June 28, 2007. During this interview, Applicant's attorney and the Examiner discussed the internal timer claim element of claim 20 in view of the Sleeper reference (US 6,401,074) and the trigger event claim element of claim 27 in view of the Agarwal et al. reference (US 6,314,466). The Examiner stated that amending in the trigger event and amending in an explanation of how it occurs would put the application in condition for allowance. It is respectfully believed that the amendments made to independent claims 20 and 30 puts the present application in condition for allowance.

II. § 103(a) Rejections

Claims 20-39 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Sleeper (U.S. 6,401,074) in view of Agarwal et al (U.S. 6,314,466). Of these claims, claims 20, 31 and 37 are independent. It is respectfully submitted that the combination of cited references fail to teach or suggest all of the elements in claims 20, 31 and 37. Claim 20 is amended to incorporate features of claim 27 and the specification on page 10, line 12 through page 11, line 24, claim 31 is amended to incorporate features of claim 35 and the specification on page 10, line 12 through page 11, line 24 and claim 37 remains unchanged.

The combination of cited references fail to teach or suggest "a customer display program module to display processed input data (i.e., related to a sales transaction) on a customer display device" and "wherein the control unit is coupled to the customer display program module and includes an internal timer, the control unit is configured to access an infomercial database that includes a sequence of multimedia entries of which the customer display program is configured

to display on the customer display device, each multimedia entry is displayed for a duration of time based on the internal timer until a trigger event occurs that interrupts the sequence of multimedia entries” as claimed in claim 20. On page three of the Office Action, the Examiner states that Sleeper includes “an internal timer.” The Applicant respectfully traverses this statement. Instead, Sleeper discloses providing real-time promotional information to a retail customer during a retail transaction on an auxiliary display. In other words, promotional information is being provided to a customer via the display at the same rate as promotional information is being received. There is no indication that Sleeper includes an internal timer, especially an internal timer that controls a duration of time that multimedia is displayed on a display.

The Examiner further states that “Sleeper fails to explicitly disclose a sequence of multimedia entries of which a customer display program” displays on a customer display device, however, Agarwal et al. discloses “a system/method for providing random access to a multimedia object over a network.” It is respectfully pointed out, however, that Agarwal et al. teaches a pre-roll transmission period for each segment of a multimedia data object. The pre-roll allows for the uninterrupted rendering of the data from any selected beginning point to completion. See col. 7, lines 30-37. Clearly, none of the cited references teach or suggest that “each multimedia entry is displayed for a duration of time based on the internal timer until a trigger event occurs that interrupts the sequence of multimedia entries.” Instead, Agarwal et al. teaches an uninterrupted rendering of data. It is respectfully submitted that claim 20 is in condition for allowance. In addition, it is respectfully submitted that claims 21-30 are also in condition for allowance at least based on their dependence on claim 20. Further, claims 21-30 are in condition for allowance for additional reasons. For example, the combination of references fail to teach or suggest that “the trigger event causes a corresponding trigger entry to be displayed on the customer display device” as claimed in claim 28. In another example, the combination of references also fail to teach or suggest that “the customer display device comprises a touch sensitive screen” such that customers can interact with the customer display device as claimed in claim 29.

The combination of cited references fail to teach or suggest “displaying the processed input data (i.e., related to a sales transaction) on a customer display device” and “displaying the sequence of multimedia entries on the customer display device, each multimedia entry is displayed for a duration of time until a trigger event occurs that interrupts the sequence of multimedia entries” as claimed in claim 31. As previously discussed with reference to claim 20, Agarwal et al. teaches a preroll transmission period for segmented data. The preroll allows for uninterrupted rendering of data. Instead, claim 31 claims that each multimedia entry is displayed for a duration of time until a trigger event occurs that interrupts the sequence. It is respectfully submitted that claim 31 is in condition for allowance. In addition, it is respectfully submitted that claims 32-36 are also in condition for allowance at least based on their dependence on claim 31. Further, claims 32-36 are in condition for allowance for additional reasons. For example, the combination of references fail to teach or suggest that “a corresponding trigger event entry is displayed on the customer display device” as claimed in claim 35.

The combination of cited references fail to teach or suggest “displaying the sequence of multimedia entries on a customer display device during the point-of-sales transaction, wherein each multimedia entry is displayed for a duration of time”, “receiving an input indicative of a trigger event while the sequence of multimedia entries are displayed” and “displaying a multimedia entry that corresponds with the trigger event” as claimed in claim 37. It is respectfully submitted that this claim was improperly and incompletely rejected in the Office Action. Although the Office Action indicates claim 37 as being rejected as being obvious in view of Sleeper and Agrawal et al., there is no indication as to what portions of these references read on the claim. Even though the rejection of claim 37 was improper, the Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of cited references fail to teach or suggest the elements of claim 37. As indicated above, Agarwal et al. teaches a preroll transmission period for segmented data. The preroll allows for uninterrupted rendering of data. Instead, claim 37 claims receiving a trigger event and displaying a multimedia entry that corresponds with the trigger event. It is respectfully submitted that claim 37 is in condition for allowance. In addition, it is respectfully submitted that

claims 38-39 are also in condition for allowance at least based on their dependence on claim 37. Further, claims 32-36 are in condition for allowance for additional reasons.

It is respectfully submitted that in light of the above remarks, claims 20-39 are patentable over the cited references. Consideration and allowance of claims 20-39 is respectfully requested.

The Director is authorized to charge any fee deficiency required by this paper or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 23-1123.

Respectfully submitted,

WESTMAN, CHAMPLIN & KELLY, P.A.

By: /Leanne R. Taveggia/
Leanne R. Taveggia, Reg. No. 53,675
900 Second Avenue South, Suite 1400
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-3244
Phone: (612) 334-3222
Fax: (612) 334-3312

LRT/jmt